

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Independent claims 1 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa (US Patent 5,608,874). Independent claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa (US Patent 5,608,874) in view of Kremen (US Patent 5,706,434). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa (US Patent # 5,608,874). Independent claim 1 requires in part: "sending a request, from a client to the server, to reformat the data in the plurality of tables..." and "reformatting, at the server, the data in the plurality of tables to a reformatted form according to rules of the software application and entering the data in the reformatted form in a database." In finding that Ogawa discloses these limitations, the Examiner cited Ogawa at column 11, lines 17-23; column 2, lines 53-60; column 23, lines 56-62; and Figure 1. However, the cited portions of Ogawa do not disclose the limitation of claim 1 requiring that the data be reformatted according to rules of the software application. Rather, Ogawa discloses, at column 2, lines 53-60 and at column 8, lines 60 through column 9, line 5, the translation of data into the format of the recipient, such as ASCII, binary files, and other different computer formats. However, this just discloses sending the data in an acceptable computer language for the recipient server (i.e. ASCII, binary files, etc.). Ogawa does not disclose the limitation of claim 1 which requires reformatting the data in the tables according to the rules of the software application and entering the data in the reformatted form in a database. In fact, Ogawa fails to disclose rules of a software application altogether. Ogawa's sending of data in an acceptable computer language for the recipient server is clearly not reformatting data according to the rules of a software application. As such, Ogawa clearly does not anticipate independent claim 1.

As a result, independent claim 1 is believed to be in allowable form and the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Each of claims 2-7 depend from independent claim 1 and add additional limitations. Therefore, each of claims 2-7 are also believed to be in allowable form and their rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Independent claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa (US Patent # 5,608,874) in view of Kremen et al (US Patent # 5,706,434). Independent claim 8 similarly requires in part: "receiving, at a server, a request sent via email from a client to assemble the data according to rules of a software application...", "assembling the data into data formatted according to the rules of the software application..." and "entering the data according to rules of the software application in a database." For the same reasons discussed above for independent claim 1, Ogawa does not disclose the limitations of claim 8 requiring formatting the data according to the rules of a software application. Kremen does not supply this deficiency. Rather, at column 6-7, lines 6-2, Kremen simply discloses receiving a request from a communication protocol, which may include a particular data format request such as the language of communication. Again, this does not meet the limitations of independent claim 8 requiring formatting the data according to the rules of a software application.

As a result, independent claim 8 is believed to be in allowable form and the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Each of claims 9-15 depend from independent claim 8 and add additional limitations. Therefore, each of claims 9-15 are also believed to be in allowable form and their rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Independent claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa (US Patent # 5,608,874). Independent claim 16 requires in part: "a code segment for receiving a request at a server to assemble data into a format that is in accord with rules of a software

application...”, “a code segment for assembling the data into the format that is in accord with rules of a software application”, and “a code segment for entering the data that is in accord with rules of a software application into a database.” For the same reasons discussed above for independent claim 1, Ogawa clearly does not disclose the limitations of claim 16 requiring formatting the data according to the rules of a software application.

As a result, independent claim 16 is believed to be in allowable form and the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Each of claims 17-20 depend from independent claim 16 and add additional limitations. Therefore, each of claims 17-20 are also believed to be in allowable form and their rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference is necessary.

Date:

11/20/07

Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon, LLP.  
205 W. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Phone: (312) 201-2721  
Fax: (312) 201-2555

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Timothy K. Klintworth  
Registration No. 46,162